

Supplemental Response mailed October 27, 2004

Reply to Final Office Action mailed July 28, 2004

Argument

As Applicants previously pointed out in their Response, the term "remote computer" recited in claim 12 and claim 21 refers to a computer that is connected to the public telephone switching network ("PTSN") via a local exchange that is different from the local exchange of the telephone line on which the call restrictor is connected. Also, independent claim 16 recites an interactive voice response (IVR) system "having an access number that is accessible via a public telephone switching network". Claim 12, 16 and 21 further recite that the call restrictor device/call restrictor and IVR/remote computer send signals/communicate via the PSTN. In all three independent claims the IVR/remote computer remotely programs the call restrictor device/call restrictor devices via signals sent over the PSTN. None of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest this limitation. Further, the Examiner has not cited any IVR system or general knowledge in the relevant art that teaches or suggests using an IVR/remote computer to remotely program a call restriction device by sending programming signals over the PSTN.

For the reasons set forth above and the reasons previously set forth in Applicant's Response, reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims 1-10, 12-19, 21-23, and 25-27 are hereby requested by the Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

October 27, 2004

Date

Dennis M. Flaherty

Reg. No. 31,159

Ostrager Chong Flaherty and
Broitman P.C.

250 Park Avenue, Suite 825
New York, New York 10177-0899
Tel. No.: (212) 681-0600

CUSTOMER NO. 44702